

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

Claims 1-8 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. The typographical error identified by the Examiner has been corrected.

Claims 1-4, 5, 7 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a) over Vikesland. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner has provided no reason for why Vikesland inherently teaches "said material having a crosslink density sufficiently high that said material and said resist do not substantially intermix." Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The modifications to claims 1 and 3 are found throughout the specification at page 14 last paragraph. Typographical errors have been corrected in claims 3 and 7. Support for added claim 20 can be found at page 16, first and second paragraph.

Claim 6 and 8 have been put into independent form and should be allowable as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement that "[t]his photosensitizer would inherently meet the recited material index of refraction as recited in claim 7. The energy beams of claims 5 and 7 are met by the disclosure found in Example 1 wherein it is known that the radiation source is a UV source." The recitation of claims 5 and 7 are not inherent in Vikesland.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.  
Reg. No. 32,053  
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598